

would have said that. Sibbison did not recall such a statement, either. Neither Sibbison nor Collier retained any notes or wrote any memoranda about the meeting.

Collier acknowledged that O'Connor had asked originally to meet with the Secretary. Collier said he made the decision not to permit such a meeting, probably without discussing it with the Secretary. Collier said he thought the Secretary knew O'Connor from his 1988 presidential bid, but that Babbitt had no strong relationship with O'Connor.

On March 15, the opponent lobbyists also met with staff from Rep. Oberstar's office. They asked, among other things, that Oberstar contact Skibine's office to verify that he would send out a letter confirming that the tribes now had a 30-day extension in which to submit additional documentation of economic impact.

4. DOI Sets April 30, 1995, Deadline For Additional Comments

Sometime after the Feb. 8 congressional meeting, Skibine realized that the failure to set a deadline for the submission of additional information might permit the opponents to string out the process indefinitely, effectively preventing a positive decision on the application. Skibine drafted, and had Duffy sign, letters to the Feb. 8 meeting participants to confirm that DOI had agreed to allow the tribes to submit additional information for consideration of the Hudson application. The letter, dated March 27, stated that any additional information would need to be submitted by April 30, 1995, in order to be considered in the review process.¹⁶⁹

A similar letter was sent to the applicant tribes, advising them that BIA was continuing to accept comments, and was now setting an April 30 deadline. The letter to the applicants

¹⁶⁹At some point after the Feb. 8 meeting, Skibine learned that the views of all tribes in Minnesota and Wisconsin, in fact, already had been solicited by letter from the area office during its initial consideration of the application.